

File Name: ISH3 5th March 2024 Part 1.mp3

File Length: 01:33:40

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:15 - 00:00:07:21

Can everyone hear me clearly?

00:00:10:20 - 00:00:14:14

And can I confirm that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:00:17:24 - 00:01:05:08

Is now 10:00. Welcome to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by Gatwick Airport Limited, who we will refer to as the applicant. An order granting development consent for Gatwick Airport Northern runway project, which will be referred to as the proposed development. As described in the application form. The application seeks powers to enable dual runway operations at Gatwick Airport through altering the existing northern runway, lifting restrictions on the new northern runways use and delivering the upgrades or additional facilities and infrastructure required to increase the passenger throughput capacity of the airport.

00:01:07:01 - 00:01:12:22

This includes substantial upgrade works to certain surface access routes which lead to the airport.

00:01:19:03 - 00:01:36:18

My name is Doctor Philip Brewer. I have a PhD in applied acoustics and I'm a member of the Institute of Acoustics. I will be chairing this hearing and making some introductory comments. And I asked my colleagues to introduce themselves. Please.

00:01:37:16 - 00:01:45:20

Good morning. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a chartered town planner and member of the Royal Town Planning Institute, and I'll be asking the majority of the questions today.

00:01:47:01 - 00:01:56:00

Good morning. My name is Kevin Gleason. I'm a town planner, a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute, and the lead member of the panel appointed to examine this application.

00:01:57:20 - 00:02:02:05

Morning, everybody. My name is John Hockley. I'm a charter town planner and a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

00:02:03:08 - 00:02:09:15

Good morning everyone. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer and a fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers.

00:02:12:21 - 00:02:42:24

Thank you. We have all been appointed by the Secretary of State to be members of this panel, and we constitute the examining authority. Or sometimes we refer to this as the EXR. This application. We will be reporting to the Secretary of State for transport as to whether the development Consent Order should be made. For those him in person. You may have met this salmon novice who is a planning inspector at Case Manager, who is supported today by Mrs.

00:02:43:03 - 00:02:46:17

Jennifer Savage and Mr. Elliot Booth from the case team.

00:02:49:22 - 00:03:10:15

If you have any questions about the examination process or the technology we are using, the case team should be your first point of contact. Before we consider the items on the agenda, there are a few housekeeping matters we need to deal with. Firstly. Can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent?

00:03:12:01 - 00:03:18:24

And those five alarm tests or drills today. So in the event of a fire alarm, please exit via the five exits either side of this room.

00:03:20:15 - 00:03:40:03

Toilets located on this floor and on the ground floor. I'm informed that car parking charges will not apply to those attending this meeting. And if you have any issues, please either speak to Reception or Mrs. Norris. Also, when using the desk based microphones, please speak into the microphone.

00:03:42:11 - 00:03:56:23

In addition to this in-person event, this hearing is taking place on the Microsoft Teams platform and is being both live streamed and recorded. For those joining online, please switch cameras and microphones off when you are just listening to the discussion.

00:03:58:13 - 00:04:13:13

Should you? Should you wish to ask the question, please use the Microsoft Teams hand function and one invited. Please turn your microphone and camera on. Please be advised that the chat function on Microsoft Teams is disabled and cannot be used.

00:04:15:24 - 00:04:29:27

If we need to turn, including the brakes, we have to stop the live stream. That's when we resume the hearing and we start the live stream. You will need to refresh your browser browser page to view the restarted stream.

00:04:34:03 - 00:05:06:09

Recordings we make are retained and published, and form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR, applies. And the Inspectorate's practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. If you take part in today's hearing, it's important that you understand that you will

be live streamed and recorded and that the recording will be published. You don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera.

00:05:08:24 - 00:05:27:20

If any individual group wishes to use social media report. Film or record during today's meeting or any subsequent hearing, and they are free to do so. But please do so responsibly and with proper consideration for other parties. This must not be disruptive and the material must not be misused.

00:05:31:18 - 00:05:42:03

The only official record of the proceedings is that this is the recording, which will be uploaded onto the planning Inspectorate's website as soon as practicable. After the hidden.

00:05:44:06 - 00:05:51:21

Tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application.

00:05:55:07 - 00:06:26:00

The hearing today will be based on structured questioning led by the ECA having regard to the published agenda. When I answer your question by referencing a document already submitted, please give the examination library reference. If you're referring to information yet to be submitted into the examination, please make this clear. Additionally, the first time you use an abbreviation or an acronym and you get the full title to enable everyone to understand your contribution.

00:06:30:09 - 00:06:49:21

This hearing will focus on issues which we wish to address primarily to the applicant. We acknowledge interested parties have not yet submitted written representations and local authorities have not yet submitted their local impact reports. After surviving from such omissions and residual matters from this hearing will be addressed later on in examination.

00:06:52:04 - 00:07:07:00

We want to take a break sometime around 1145 for 15 minutes. As I'm sure you're aware, we need to close this hearing no later than 1 p.m., as we have issue specific hearing for starting at 2 p.m..

00:07:09:09 - 00:07:18:14

The czar has a list of those persons present today who wish to speak in relation to the various agenda items, and we note everyone who gave advance notice of wishing to attend his present.

00:07:20:29 - 00:07:34:23

It is not our intention to do full introductions at this point. However, for the purposes of identification, for the benefit of those who may be watching the recording later, those intended to speak will be asked to state their name and who they represent. Additionally.

00:07:36:22 - 00:07:42:12

Please again, give your name and any organization you are representing every time invited to speak during the hearing.

00:07:45:00 - 00:08:00:27

I would now like to turn to the agenda for this hearing. The agenda for this hearing was published and placed on the Planning Inspectorate website on the 30th of January, 2024. The main issues to be examined at this issue specific hearing are. Socio economic assessment.

00:08:02:21 - 00:08:17:02

The proposed employment, skills and business strategy. Labor, supply and housing. The need for a health equality impact assessment. And vulnerable groups. Also vulnerable group populations.

00:08:19:06 - 00:08:38:22

We will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of it. We'll conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made, and all questions asked and responded to. It may be necessary to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. In the event that the discussions are incomplete or take longer than planned.

00:08:41:00 - 00:08:53:07

It is important that we get the right answers to the questions we're going to ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or required time to get the information requested, then rather than giving an incomplete, scripted or potentially wrong answer

00:08:54:23 - 00:09:13:07

dissemination, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing? And we can then defer the question to the next round of written questions or a later hearing. As noted the preliminary meeting. The examination is predominantly a written process, supplemented when necessary by hearings.

00:09:16:04 - 00:09:46:09

To conclude each item, the EXR will generally invite the applicant to make any final comments they have on any representations made during the discussions. Finally, this is a hearing and not an inquiry, and therefore there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross questioning of other parties as such. Any questions that you may have for other parties need to be asked through the EXR. This approach is set out in section 94 of the Planning Act 2008.

00:09:47:15 - 00:09:57:12

So I would now like to move to agenda item two. And will pass to Miss Cassini to take us to the next agenda items. Thank you.

00:09:59:21 - 00:10:42:25

Thank you doctor. As previously outlined, the purpose of these hearings is to focus on issues with which the EXR wishes to address, primarily to the applicant. At this stage of the examination, consideration will focus on the applicant's position. Although interested parties and in particular the key local authorities will be asked for their views where appropriate. We acknowledge that interested parties have not yet submitted written representations, and local authorities have not yet submitted their local impact reports. What is arising from such submissions in relation to socioeconomics and health and well-being will be addressed subsequently in either written questions and or a further issue specific hearing if necessary.

00:10:43:27 - 00:11:15:26

As detailed, this hearing seeks to consider several issues in relation to socio economic economics and the health and wellbeing. Both of these topics cover extensive grounds, and I'm aware that several people have registered to speak. You've already heard from Doctor Brewer our proposed timings for this morning's issue specific hearing. I'm keen to ensure that these are adhered to. If necessary, any items not considered today will be carry forward into written questions or potentially another hearing. I have a list of questions that I'd like to ask the applicant.

00:11:15:29 - 00:11:40:03

Based on my understanding and reading of both the case and the relevant representations submitted. So help the hearing room as smoothly as possible. I intend to run through my questions on the agenda items with the applicant first before asking for confirmation, before asking for contributions from the local authorities and then others present. Does anybody have any questions on that agenda item?

00:11:41:23 - 00:12:16:04

No thank you. So we will now move on to agenda item three, which is the socio economic assessment. And I am aware that this topic is very wide ranging. However, I am going to ask that we just focus on the areas identified on the agenda only today in order that we get through everything. So my first question to the applicant is in terms of the baseline data used for the assessment, a number of representations have been made in terms of the age of this data, in terms of the age of the baseline data sources.

00:12:16:06 - 00:12:32:23

And that concern has been raised given that this data is used to inform a number of assessments. Could you provide comment on this and confirm whether more up to date data is available, and if so, would this have any implications for the results of the assessments undertaken please?

00:12:34:11 - 00:12:43:15

Good morning, ma'am. Scott Linus KC for the applicants. Um, I'll ask Mr. Kieran Jones, introduce himself first of all, and then answer that question. Thank you.

00:12:46:28 - 00:12:48:12

Good morning, Sir Kieran Jones.

00:12:48:14 - 00:12:49:22

From Lichfield, lead.

00:12:49:24 - 00:12:51:22

Author of the socio economic assessment.

00:12:51:28 - 00:12:54:14

Um, here for the applicant.

00:12:55:01 - 00:13:33:06

Um, in terms of the generality of the approach that we've taken in the assessment, um, that uses the latest data available at the point of preparation. Um, so, for example, at the time of the preliminary

Environmental Information Report, um, that was late 2019, early 2020, uh, data. And then by the time we got to the full submission environmental statement submission, uh, in mid 2023, clearly there had been further information and data made available, um, some of which was um, clearly at that time affected by what was happening in the wider economy in relation to Covid.

00:13:33:11 - 00:14:09:07

Um, so we took the approach to, uh, retain the uh, pre-COVID position, uh, because we felt that that provided a, uh, a benchmark against which the economy was operating at a normal level or operating in normal conditions, but where there had been a, uh, updates to that data or new data had become available, then we also incorporated that into the assessment, um, and effectively what that presented us, whether it was a blended approach of both pre and post Covid data, um, if you like.

00:14:09:09 - 00:14:46:03

And the rationale really for doing that was that it meant we had a view of what the kind of long term characteristics of the Crawley, uh, and the wider assessment areas sort of geography is in terms of its sort of characteristics and conditions, um, which we think is helpful as a reference point for a project with an opening year of 2029, but of course, could also start to see particular areas where Covid and indeed other macroeconomic changes had started to have a bearing on things and a good example of later data not necessarily being better data.

00:14:46:06 - 00:15:22:21

Um, is, for example, the 2021 census information that was released in batches during the course of 2022 and in 2023 and post submission the uh census travel to work area data at local authority level was released. Um, but of course, that had been recorded in March 2021 when there were lots of restrictions. Uh, there were lots of, uh, furloughed staff across the country and so on. And actually, um, you know, even ons advise that caution is required on the use of that data for sort of policy and planning sort of purposes.

00:15:22:23 - 00:16:01:11

So I think, in summary, our position is that the age of the baseline data, the range of sources that have been used is a robust and proportionate, uh, starting point. But it is also a pragmatic approach, given the inevitable volatility of data points that were arising around the period that we that we're considering. And I think more broadly, the very nature of socioeconomic data is such that it it will always sort of change. And, uh, you know, more recent data points will have had other influences, be it, you know, the withdrawal from the European Union, be it the Ukraine, be it inflation and, and all sorts of other factors.

00:16:01:13 - 00:16:12:24

So from our perspective, when you put all of those points together, our view is that the use of some other later data points wouldn't have a material effect on the assessment that we put.

00:16:15:11 - 00:16:49:15

Thank you for that. Um. Concern has also been raised by several local authorities that the assessment of socio economic effects has been undertaken at different geographical levels, but that the assessment of impacts at a local authority level has not been fully undertaken, and therefore the assessment is

failed to identify specific local authority effects. I'd be grateful if you could give me, um, your view on this and whether you consider effects at a local authority level have been adequately assessed.

00:16:49:17 - 00:16:56:07

And is it necessary to review the geographical scope of the assessment given the comments that have been received?

00:16:57:20 - 00:17:01:04

Scotland of the last Mr. John Jones pick up that question as well. Thank you.

00:17:03:20 - 00:17:41:20

That caring agent for the applicant. So in our submission, we've defined a series of assessment areas that effectively relate to the different nature of the effects that we are considering in this oceanic assessment. And in our view, defining and assessing those effects at an individual local authority level isn't the most appropriate basis for assessment purposes. And I think we're essentially sort of three three reasons for that. Firstly, the socioeconomic assessment is dealing with quite a broad range of subtopics within it.

00:17:41:25 - 00:18:20:12

So we've got employment and labour market, we've got population and housing, we've got business and resident disruption, we've got access to community facilities and so on. So having a sort of one size fits all assessment area or areas is actually not really the best way of doing it. And certainly given the variety of subtopics that we're dealing with in that assessment, um, you know, following local government administrative boundaries wouldn't, in our view, be the most appropriate basis for, for undertaking that assessment? So, um, the second issue is we've very much looked to have regard to national planning practice guidance where that is relevant.

00:18:20:14 - 00:18:52:25

So for example, in terms of looking at employment in the economy, we've drawn on the North West Sussex functional economic market area, which is, you know, what is defined in the PG planning practice guidance as you know, what you generally will look to consider when assessing interrelationships between areas. Uh, in the case of population and housing, we may come onto this under the later agenda item. We've looked at the relevant housing market area. So very much using the building blocks, if you like, that the planning system would conventionally use in assessing these kind of different types of, of issues.

00:18:53:12 - 00:19:28:06

And then I think probably thirdly, in a, perhaps the most practically is, is the reality that we are, you know, operating in an area which has very highly interconnected local economies, um, you know, across Crawley, North and West Sussex, the south east more widely. And again, the sense that the project impacts would become confined to any one of those individual administrative areas, um, is not what we think is the best basis for looking at this. And indeed, you know, government policy more broadly would support labour market mobility, housing market choice and so on and so forth.

00:19:28:08 - 00:20:04:14

So for those reasons, we've looked at indeed some five different assessment areas within the social economic assessment. Those are set out in detail. Um, para 17 .4. 11 of chapter 17 of the ES submission. In very summary terms, those go from the smaller local level. So the project site boundary, a local study area, which is sort of the urban areas and settlements, can terminus to, uh, the airport. And that was expanded at Pier Stage in response to consultation comments, we then look at the northern West Sussex function.

00:20:04:16 - 00:20:42:27

Market areas are Crawley, Horsham and Mid Sussex. Again that was added at Post Pier stage in response to consultation comments. And indeed that that theme has been used for local plan making for the best part of a decade in this area is well established and indeed is supporting the current emerging Crawley Local Plan. We then also looked at Gatwick s uh, actual functional labour market area. So using Gatwick Pass holder data to see where essentially Gatwick workers are drawn upon, and that by doing so has sidestepped the issue that might have come from using more up to date census information.

00:20:43:17 - 00:21:21:08

Um, we've also then finally looked at the six authorities area, the widest area over which, um, socioeconomic effects could be realised. That is consistent with the economic impact work being prepared by Auxerre as part of the application. And that area includes some 37 local authority areas. And then finally, in addition to all of those where it's relevant, for example, in the population housing assessment, we've also had regard to the relevant housing market areas that interface with the assessment areas that we've defined. So I think our position taking all of that together is we would say that we have an appropriate and proportionate set of assessment areas.

00:21:21:12 - 00:21:52:28

The assesses significance at the most relevant study area relative to the type of impact that is being assessed. And I think finally, having said all of that, the approach hasn't been entirely agnostic, if you like, of the effects that could arise at a local authority level. So where it is possible to do so within the appendices supporting the assessment, we've tabulated the impact that could arise at the relevant individual local authority level.

00:21:53:00 - 00:22:25:21

So for example, particularly around, uh, employment, particularly around housing effects and so on. So that information, that information is there and it is visible. For the authorities to see if they wish to to do so. The only thing we haven't done is essentially because we don't believe it's appropriate, is then assess the significance of the impact of every single one of those, potentially up to 37 local authority areas that fit within our overall assessment area. So I'd say overall, we believe the approach is appropriate and proportionate and relevant to the effects that we're assessing.

00:22:25:23 - 00:22:31:24

But visibility on individual local authority impacts, where those can be defined has been provided as part of the submission.

00:22:33:22 - 00:23:09:12



Thank you. We now turn to the community fund. Um, as I understand it, there's an existing community fund, um, through the Gatwick Airport Community Trust, which is funded under an obligation in the current section 106. The level of funding is linked to annual passenger numbers, and is also complemented by discretionary and voluntary arrangement by Gatwick Airport Limited, known as the Gatwick Foundation Fund, which supports a range of community projects across Kent, Surrey and Sussex and is managed by individual community foundations.

00:23:10:29 - 00:23:44:20

It's proposed that these funds will be merged to create one single Gatwick Community Fund, again secured through the provision of the new section 106. I'd like you to give me an update on the following areas, please. I am going to read quite a few bullet points out here, so if you do require me to go back over them, that's fine. The first one is financial value and will the funding be linked to annual passenger numbers distribution? How will the funds be distributed? As currently, as said, there are two different approaches.

00:23:45:04 - 00:24:01:29

What discussions have taken place with relevant local authorities? What level of community consultation has taken place and what would happen in respect of the community funds should the new section 106 be delayed? Thank you.

00:24:04:06 - 00:24:13:10

Uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. Um, Alaska. Uh, Allison added. Pick up that question, please. She's been introduced to the, uh, the examination previously.

00:24:15:03 - 00:24:17:08

Thank you Alison. For the applicant.

00:24:18:05 - 00:24:50:24

So on financial value, I can confirm that we propose to still use, um, a calculation linked to passenger numbers. Um, the reason for doing this is to ensure that, um, we're able to scale the level of funding, um, in relation to airport growth through the northern runway. Uh, so what we have done is obviously in the you've mentioned the existing voluntary section 106 agreement that has been placed, um, which has actually supported community funding for over 20 years.

00:24:51:05 - 00:25:18:14

Um, with the local community, uh, in our most recent, uh, revision of that section 106, that's when we moved to the, um, uh, linked passenger number funding calculation. And so we're as that's an already agreed principle, we're taking that forward. But what we're doing is scaling that up, um, so that it's proportionate, um, to the, uh, northern runway growth.

00:25:21:16 - 00:25:22:09

Thank you.

00:25:25:03 - 00:25:30:07

And as far as the other headings are concerned, we just run through each of those. Ma'am.

00:25:30:09 - 00:25:33:04

Thank you sir. Yes, sorry if you'd just like to go through each of them.

00:25:33:13 - 00:26:13:28

Yeah, I can go through each of those. So, um. Yes, you've set out the fact that we can't have currently have the Gatwick Airport Community Trust, but we have been working on a discretionary basis with the community foundations of Kent, Surrey and Sussex. And in developing this proposal for the northern runway, we are looking to take the sort of the best of both approaches and, as I say, make sure that we're providing a mechanism that is really designed to ensure that you have the correct resources and the correct connections into the local community to make this fund as effective as possible.

00:26:14:03 - 00:26:46:20

So the method for distribution will be a new fund. Uh, the uh fund will be distributed, um, through a, um, well, if I start with how the applications will arise. So the community foundations will actually work to bring forward the applications and do initial review. We will then have, um, a funding panel for each area. And that fund funding panel will comprise of representatives of the community foundations, but also Gatwick Airport Limited.

00:26:46:22 - 00:27:08:19

And we're proposing, uh, representatives from the county council for the respective areas. Uh, that will be, um, the mechanism by which the sort of decision making is made on the projects that are successful in receiving funding. And then the community foundations will distribute that funding on um Gatwick Airport Limited's behalf.

00:27:10:14 - 00:27:49:28

Thank you. Um. So then moving. I think I've, uh, sort of covered, um, method of just distribution in terms of discussions with the local authorities. Uh, the proposal has been included in the draft section 106, and we have had initial comments, which we're currently reviewing. Um, and we'll be looking to work through those comments and, um, reach a conclusion through the section 106 process to ensure that we've got an appropriate mechanism in place. Um, what I should also say is that the current Gatwick Airport Community Trust includes, um, uh, trustees that are representatives of local authorities.

00:27:50:08 - 00:28:16:17

Uh, so that's includes Surrey County Council, West Sussex County Council, Crawley Borough Council, um, as well as some other local community representatives as trustees. So, uh, we have briefed the chair of the trustees and throughout this process, and, uh, the chair has also now briefed the trustees on the proposal, and we've received some questions which we will address, um, through that route as well.

00:28:19:17 - 00:28:56:16

Uh, and in terms of, um, community consultation, uh, the community fund was referenced, um, in the initial PEPFAR. Um, and also in the um, uh, final planning, uh, statement as well. Uh, in terms of when the community fund, uh, becomes live. Um, the important, uh, sort of benefit of working with

the community foundations is that they are so strongly connected in with the local communities to ensure that, uh, the respective needs of those local communities are being addressed directly.

00:28:57:01 - 00:29:01:14

Um, and for our in our experience, that's that's worked very effectively.

00:29:03:17 - 00:29:16:25

Uh, Scotlands for the applicant. You did have a final question about potential delay. I think the intention is that there is a rollover between the existing and the proposed 106, but perhaps they could ask Mr. Norwood to explain that further.

00:29:19:00 - 00:29:19:29

Morning, Tim.

00:29:20:01 - 00:29:51:24

Lord for the applicant. Yes. The intention is that the existing section 106, uh, which actually comes to, um, it expires at the end of this year. Uh, so the intention and this is still subject to ongoing discussions with the local authorities, but our intention is to continue the existing section 106 and roll it over into next year. And then depending on the outcome of this, um, examination, uh, there would be um, it would then change over to the new section 106 agreement.

00:29:51:26 - 00:30:07:21

So in effect, there would be no gap and no shortfall in any of the funding between the existing section 106 and the new section 106. We'd want to roll it over so that they were so that they were aligned basically. Um, so that would be, uh, that would be done sometime.

00:30:09:11 - 00:30:10:26

Hopefully around this time next year.

00:30:12:19 - 00:30:38:23

It's got minus for the applicant, as I think it's been mentioned, that previous issue specific hearings, we have had fairly detailed comments back from the joint local authorities on the draft at 106. And when that draft is submitted to you, a deadline to I think then we can obviously update you on where those progressions have reached in respect of the approach taken of the community funds. We should be able to update you in more detail then.

00:30:40:18 - 00:30:59:00

Thank you. That's very helpful. I mean, you you will hear us referring back to any potential delays in 100 Six's throughout because obviously, the importance that the potential draft, well, potential 1 or 6 includes. So it is important that we understand what are the implications. Should that be delayed?

00:30:59:09 - 00:31:30:24

Yes. Scotland for the applicant, perhaps it's convenient to mention here that one part that we've been contemplating is whether you would find it helpful to have a table which builds upon the information that was sent to you about the existing controls, including those in the 106 and comparison with how they're being translated into the new 106 and that can possibly pick up any such issues relating to how

obligations are set under the existing obligations are going to be transferred across into the new. And we can we can pick up the point that you mentioned that way.

00:31:31:06 - 00:31:59:17

Yeah, that that would be very useful for ourselves. And obviously everybody else involved because they can get could be quite complicated and lengthy documents. So for ease of understanding I think that would be useful. Thank you. That is the end of my questions on this agenda item to the applicant. So I'd like to turn to Mr. Bedford. If yourself or your colleagues have any comments to make on behalf of the joint local authorities in terms of the questions have asked.

00:32:02:13 - 00:32:09:09

Thank you, madam. Michael Bedford King's Council, on behalf of the Joint local authorities.

00:32:11:15 - 00:33:02:22

And dealing with those three topics or subtopics, uh, in term. In relation to the question of the robustness of the baseline, uh, data. Come. Madam, we do have concerns that elements of that data do not use the most up to date and data sets, and that that has the potential to mean that trends which are manifesting themselves are not being adequately picked up in the assessment.

00:33:03:22 - 00:33:38:04

That is, there's a particular example in relation to economic activity rates, which whether it is solely due to consequences of Covid or whether it is due to wider macro economic considerations. The trends that we are picking up, which are borne out by the most recent data, is that economic activity rates are falling. And that is so in Crawley, in Horsham and across West Sussex.

00:33:38:26 - 00:34:12:02

And that obviously has implications for the pool of available workers that are local to the project. And that then obviously follows through as to, um, the assumptions that are being made about home based and non home based workers and so on. So without developing the point, I say there is a concern that if you don't use the most up to date data, you don't capture what the trends are and how they are therefore likely to influence your.

00:34:13:04 - 00:34:56:09

Um assessment similarly. We have a concern and I know that housing is a topic, a separate topic which we will come on to. But we do have a concern, particularly in relation to the assessment of, uh, um, what might be the private rented sector, which often provides the pool, uh, of accommodation, um, uh, particularly towards the lower end of the market. And our, our understanding from the technical note, which is the assessment of population and housing effects app dash 201.

00:34:57:15 - 00:35:14:17

Is that it's primarily based on some analysis that was carried out by the consultants Litchfield. Using 2011 census data, and we think that's shown in table 6.2.1.

00:35:16:13 - 00:35:41:13

That information is then used by the applicant. In the assessment of the vacant private rented sector properties for the locality. In table 6.2.2, and that then feeds into the proportions of non home based workers as a proportion of total bed spaces in table 6.2.4.

00:35:43:10 - 00:36:17:25

And. Well, what we see is that if you look at the data that is presented using that, um, uh, those series of data sources, for example, in Crawley. What it's being suggested that the data tells us is that there's some 119 vacant private rented sector properties available, to which they then apply the non home base worker um figures to suggest that there is sufficient.

00:36:18:19 - 00:36:54:24

Accommodation available that there would not be undue pressures. Whereas we think that if you look at more up to date data on the private rented sector within Crawley, because that information is available on a quarterly basis. We think the monitoring is showing that at times it's as low as 35 properties available, up to a ceiling of about 86 properties available, obviously significantly different in terms of then relating that to the non home based workers.

00:36:54:26 - 00:36:57:20

So those are just as were examples. But.

00:36:59:06 - 00:37:29:09

There are a number of instances where we have concerns that the data sources are not the most up to date, and therefore they're not capturing, um, a appropriate picture of what the implications of the project will be on a number of socioeconomic factors. So that that was the point about dated ness on on the point about geographic scale.

00:37:29:11 - 00:37:55:12

The second of your, uh, topics. Uh. We don't consider that the applicant has adequately drilled down, uh, in the way that the, uh, data is presented in order to provide a picture of what, uh, is likely to happen at local authority level.

00:37:58:20 - 00:38:26:00

It's fair to say that some of the applicant's supporting data sets in the appendices do include, as I think has been indicated, information at local authority level. But I think the applicant has been quite candid in saying that information has not been used in order to inform the significance of effects.

00:38:28:06 - 00:38:57:02

And if I can give an example in terms of receptor sensitivities. And this is in chapter 17 itself, which is APB 042. Uh, in table 17.6 0.6. Part of that table deals with the sensitivity as a receptor category housing supply.

00:38:58:24 - 00:39:29:10

And what that looks at is as a receptor, the local study area that had been referred to the functional economic market area that has been referred to, and the labor market area which has been referred to, and the sensitivities which are being presented are all in the categories. Well, it's low in two cases and very low in one case. And that is, we think, the result of aggregating together.

00:39:30:16 - 00:40:06:09

The individual local authorities and what their performance is because, again, and I know we've got it as a separate topic, if we take Crawley and its position in terms of affordable housing pressures and supply of available housing, we think that the positioning Crawley is far more sensitive and you would not categorise that as a low sensitivity receptor. But obviously if you take the wider areas, you, as it were, you mask impacts.

00:40:07:09 - 00:40:31:18

And so we think that's a problem, particularly with housing. We also think it's a problem when one looks at the skills base within the individual districts. And again we highlight Crawley as an example of that. So that's the second of the topics. And then on the um the third topic of the community fund,

00:40:33:09 - 00:40:42:28

obviously we welcome engagement with the applicant about that. And as has been indicated, there is a dialogue in terms of the section 106.

00:40:44:27 - 00:41:20:02

Um. I don't want to trespass into what is, I say, a matter of active, uh, negotiation. But we do have concerns that the community fund has proposed, which is intended to be relevant to planning in line with the guidance in the, uh, um, airport NPS. So it's not, as it were, sitting outside of the planning process, which is slightly different to some other infrastructure projects you may be aware of, uh, particularly in terms of the way that energy projects are dealt with.

00:41:20:04 - 00:41:57:27

So this is we're dealing with something which is properly a material consideration within the planning sphere. Uh, and the community Fund is intended to address the intangible but residual impacts of the development on affected, uh, receptors. And we consider that the, uh, the basic approach, uh, is inadequate in terms of the resource. There was a reference briefly to in the applicant's comments to scaling up the existing arrangements.

00:41:58:11 - 00:42:01:27

Um, but effectively what we see.

00:42:04:11 - 00:42:41:14

Is that the way that utilizing the numbers of passengers translates? Um, when one gets to the 80 million level. I think we've got a figure. So that's the 80 million passengers per annum, and I think we've got a figure of £1 million and it comes out, it's about 11.2 £0.05, one and a quarter pence per, uh, passenger. Um, and when one's at the 40 million level, it's about a halfpenny per passenger, half 0.5 of a pence.

00:42:41:27 - 00:43:16:11

And I say, I know there's a negotiation, there's a discussion, but we just think that the, uh, the scale that's being suggested is not appropriate, uh, for dealing with the residual impacts of the development. There are, I say, some further discussions, which I think will need to take place in the context of the

dialogue about the, um, the distribution mechanism. Uh, and whilst we certainly recognise the established, uh, use of the, um.

00:43:19:19 - 00:43:31:10

Community foundations. And obviously we're supportive of of that approach. There's there is a question as to whether simply having the three foundations effectively on a county basis.

00:43:32:26 - 00:44:03:09

Allows for a fair distribution of the resources to those who are more likely to be affected by these residual impacts. So there's just a question mark for us, and I think we need to explore that with the applicant as to whether, um, that kind of three level as it were, approach or three. Area approach is appropriate, as opposed to perhaps something that's more pro rata to populations within areas that may experience impacts.

00:44:03:13 - 00:44:11:11

And so we don't have a definitive position on that. But it's an area of concern and therefore dialogue for further discussion.

00:44:14:00 - 00:44:14:17

Think.

00:44:16:03 - 00:44:46:20

But, madam, that's the main point. I think we would welcome, uh, some further clarity from the applicant on this point about the timescale of bridging the gap in the section 106, uh, arrangements. Uh, and obviously there's a hard, um, um, as it were, deadline at the moment, the existing 106 has a finite terminus date, and it's making sure that there isn't a hiatus. And so obviously, that's something that I think we can explore with the applicant.

00:44:46:22 - 00:44:53:15

It seems that in principle, uh, we all want the same effect. It's just getting to it. Thank you. Madam.

00:44:55:09 - 00:45:05:05

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Before I turn to the applicant for any comments, is there anybody else in the room or virtually that would like to comment on any of the agenda items, please?

00:45:09:15 - 00:45:23:04

I think Cagney. And then. And I'm aware there's two people virtually as well. So who take the people in the room first, and then I will turn to the two people virtually as well. Good morning madam. Thank you for.

00:45:23:06 - 00:45:24:03

That. Sally Pavey.

00:45:24:05 - 00:45:46:16

For Cagney. Um, we are also very concerned by the 106 and the community Fund, and I appreciate it's tomorrow on aviation noise, but we would like to bring the subject up within the noise and the impact

of the noise, um, to ensure that this community fund reflects and then goes to those impacted by the actual noise created. Thank you.

00:45:48:05 - 00:45:49:00

Thank you.

00:45:50:17 - 00:45:55:26

I think there's another lady. Yeah. Please do take a seat.

00:45:57:29 - 00:46:17:09

Thank you, Lisa Scott Parish Council. And again, it's on behalf of the fund. And it seems to be, um, minuscule considering the number of passengers coming through in the amount of money that will come to local authorities from each passenger, as was pointed out by Casey.

00:46:19:07 - 00:46:50:26

This seems to not really be adequate to cover the impacts that an expansion to this extent would happen on local communities. My community in particular, we flanked the airport on two sides. We can imagine a huge increase in road traffic, both light vehicles and heavy vehicles coming through our parish. We've been pressing for a long time for additional funding for infrastructure, for active transport.

00:46:50:28 - 00:47:30:23

We've got pavements that are non connected, so our residents are physically unable to walk into the airport at the moment without walking on the road. And we've been requesting for those kinds of links to be put in place so that local residents that work at the airport can have the same level of access, safe access, out of road access that we see coming from Crawley into South Terminal. And the funding that appears to be on offer here isn't going to go anywhere near what's needed to give those sorts of infrastructure improvements that we feel our residents really deserve.

00:47:32:16 - 00:47:40:21

Thank you. Thank you both. For now, turn to virtual people, Sir Alex Chapman. You'd like to put your camera on.

00:47:43:24 - 00:48:22:15

Just let me go. Hi. Uh, thanks very much for the chance to speak. My name's Alex Chapman. I'm a senior economist at the New Economics Foundation. Uh, charitable think tank. Um, fairly straightforward question. Um, relating to the sort of the dating of baseline data that underpins the economic assessments. Um, it relates to the use of prices and discounting. When I say prices, I mean, um, considering, you know, future impacts of inflation or past impacts of inflation when arriving at a forecast or a prediction of an economic estimate.

00:48:23:00 - 00:48:56:09

And when I refer to discounting, I'm talking about, um, the decision to, um, reduce the value of um, future goods or impacts, um, on the basis that the sort of presumed basis that impacts in the future are worth less than impacts. Um, today I realise that's a bit of an esoteric technical question, but hopefully



will make sense in a second. The the applicant's local economic impact assessment underpinning the need case uses prices from 2022 and starts discounting from 2022.

00:48:56:17 - 00:49:31:03

Which sounds normal to me. Um, is what I'd expect to see. But the National Economic Impact Assessment, which is appendix one to the need case, uses prices and discounting starting from 2010. Um, and I'd like to ask the applicant, um, it would assist me greatly in preparing my, um, written representation as to why that decision was taken. Um, typically when you conduct an assessment like that, according to DFT guidelines, um, you would base your prices and your discounting start date.

00:49:31:05 - 00:50:04:03

In the relatively recent past, when the DFT assessed Gatwick expansion back in 2017 for the, um, the process, uh, going on through Parliament at the time, they used prices and discounting from 2014. So three years prior here we're dealing with prices and discounting based 14 years ago, which is a very long time ago. Um, and means that when you're reading the National Economic Impact Assessment, it's hard to understand how to read the numbers as to what their actual magnitude is. For example, when the scheme starts, its, uh, functioning in 2029.

00:50:04:17 - 00:50:19:24

Um, you're looking at discounting, which will have essentially halved the value of every impact that the scheme is producing before the scheme has even started. Um, so it's an unusual decision to start in 2010. It's a very dated point to start from, and I'd just like to hear the applicant's views and why they've done that.

00:50:21:06 - 00:50:26:01

Thank you, Doctor Chapman. If we could now turn to Councillor Lockwood.

00:50:28:07 - 00:51:02:20

Uh, yes. Uh, hopefully, uh, you can see and hear me. Um, so, uh, I'm representing Lynnfield and Dawson Parish Council. Um, the the first point I want to make is the, uh, issue with noise, uh, fines. So the community trust fund currently receives fines, uh, funding from the fining of aircraft that, uh, create noise incidents. Um, and, uh, to report this as an individual, it's quite a difficult process. It has to be done through the Gatwick, uh, Webb track facility.

00:51:03:02 - 00:51:35:15

Um, and I think going forward, it would be useful if we could send in our, uh, noise incident complaints, uh, via email. Most of us have the, uh, flight weight radar apps on our on our smartphones, and we're able to catch capture, uh, the technical and, uh, information about a flight that's, that's causing an issue. Uh, and if we could email that to get whic, uh, then it might mean that there would be more fines coming through to the fund.

00:51:35:24 - 00:52:07:09

Um, so making that kind of reporting more straightforward, more simple would be an improvement. The principle of the fund doesn't specifically benefit everybody who is impacted by the noise and disturbance of the airport. There is a a noise abatement scheme where you can get secondary glazing.

Uh, for your properties, it's a completely separate, uh, funding stream from Gatwick. However, it's, uh, very dependent on the noise contours.

00:52:07:11 - 00:52:41:00

So. And I will point this out here now. Uh, although it is a noise related issue, it's it shows that the community funding doesn't meet the needs of the people. So one side of Linfield High Street gets the funding and the other side doesn't. Whereas. And the point here is, is that the ordinary households in the Lingfield and Normanton areas don't necessarily benefit from the Gatwick uh Trust Fund. It might be the local play group, but that we're only talking about the benefits going to a particular, uh, clique or group of people.

00:52:41:02 - 00:53:16:22

And it tends to be the same people, the same sorts of community groups that apply for the funding because of the constraints on which the funding is allocated. Um, so actually widening the remit for, for the applications would enable the local communities to, uh, find some sort of compensation for the local residents. Um, we here in Dortmund and Linfield have a strong reservations about the community, the Surrey Community Foundation being the, uh, the focus for the grant fund application.

00:53:16:24 - 00:53:59:07

No one in Linfield or and has ever heard of the Surrey Community Foundation. Um it is a distance away. Um we tend to get overlooked here in East Surrey and we are the part of Surrey that is most impacted by Gatwick, uh, noise. Um, so I think, um, it needs to be made very clear that, um, that community engagement from Gatwick to enable parish councils and community groups to have access to the Surrey Community Foundation in a more open and transparent way would be, uh, a definitely, uh, a point to consider.

00:53:59:09 - 00:54:32:24

So, uh, and obviously, um, just as your financial advisor would advise you, uh, some, uh, income will go up or down, depending on the economy, if we, God forbid, have another Covid, then, um, we've already seen how the community trust fund, uh, has, has dipped because Gatwick has not been making enough money to put into the pot. Uh, and yet we still suffer the noise consequences. But there's a time lag between the income going into the pot and us getting the benefits.

00:54:32:26 - 00:54:33:16

Thank you.

00:54:35:06 - 00:54:50:04

Thank you, Councilor Lockwood. Uh, let me see, I don't think. Oh, no. Sorry, Miss Christie, you do actually have a seat at the table if you want. Or if you're happy to use the roving microphone. It's entirely up to you.

00:54:59:01 - 00:54:59:19

Thank you.

00:55:01:04 - 00:55:01:29

Thank you.

00:55:02:02 - 00:55:03:27

Um, Anna Christie, CEO.

00:55:03:29 - 00:55:04:15

Of Sussex.

00:55:04:17 - 00:55:07:20

Chamber. I wasn't aware that I had to take a seat at the table.

00:55:08:01 - 00:55:09:00

That's fine. Thank you.

00:55:09:07 - 00:55:45:18

Um, just to, um, verify as well that the, um, Sussex Chamber of Commerce has been leading on the Sussex Local Skills Improvement Plan, which we were awarded as a trailblazer. And then we've developed this. We have data as well that we've carried out. And we issued a report to December 22nd, which has an overview of the Sussex labour market, which goes into detail into and that's also with ONS data. Nami's data also working with Department for Work and Pensions in terms of claimant data by age, looking at the different areas.

00:55:45:20 - 00:55:49:28

So I'm happy to share that um, with the inspectorate. Thank you.

00:55:50:06 - 00:55:54:25

Thank you very much. Is there anybody else in the room or virtually?

00:55:59:28 - 00:56:53:20

Thank you. Thank you. Councillor Essex. Um, brief question in in response, I think the applicant was noting in your question about consultation, but it seemed like that there hasn't been an explicit consultation on this aspect. And my concern is that that local, effective community should be given the right to a consultation to see how the distributive effects of, of how the fund is spent are considered. And I would be interested to know about the mechanism by which, um, passing the funds to three county level bodies, make sure that the distribution of funds, um, is able to benefit the most affected communities, rather than end up being distributed across 3 or 4 counties and not necessarily, um, recompense in the communities that are most directly affected by Gatwick operations now and the Gatwick plans for the future.

00:56:53:22 - 00:56:54:14

Thank you.

00:56:55:07 - 00:57:00:18

Thank you, counselor. I'll now turn to the applicant. In terms of response, please.

00:57:01:02 - 00:57:39:09

Scott, for the applicant. Thank you ma'am. I'll give some brief overview points, and then I'll go along the table to see if any of the individual members of the team have anything to add. But first, with Mr. Bedford's point and breaking those down into, first of all, the issue over the date of the baseline data. Um, some of the points, at least, in fact, all of the points that Mr. Bedford raised were matters of detail that I don't think we've actually heard, uh, before. Um, uh, and we presume there will be picked up in the local impact report or other discussions that take place between the local authorities and, uh, the applicant.

00:57:39:17 - 00:58:11:06

One thing I would say there was a matter of generality. Um, we haven't seen an explanation as to why the updated information that Mr. Bedford has referred to is regarded as being both reliable as an input, and to assessment and or any explanation as to why it would necessarily make a difference to the work that we have done. So we would need to see some explanation of that even before we get into the, uh, the detail of it. Um. The point about the private rented sector in particular.

00:58:11:08 - 00:58:47:00

Perhaps that's better picked up on the item five when we look at, um, at other housing matters, but we haven't seen, as I said, any information from the local authority to date, which disturbs the conclusion that we've reached about the merits of having the blended approach based on some 2019 data and some selected data, selected updated data, and we still haven't seen any information suggest there's other data which is sufficiently important that we should look at it again, and recognition of the fact that there will be information all the time coming up as an applications being determined.

00:58:47:02 - 00:58:55:01

And we just haven't seen anything to explain why it would be important to look at this other material. Um, as for the question of geography.

00:58:56:18 - 00:59:31:19

Um. As Mr. Gonzalez explained, we have actually provided information within the application material, which breaks down material to local authority areas, including data sets, aspects of the population, housing assessment and other material in annex for to the local impact. Local Economic Impact Assessment app at 200. Again, same point. We haven't seen any explanation as yet to explain why, um, that data would need to be assessed at a local level.

00:59:31:21 - 01:00:14:06

The basic proposition being that impacts as recognised in national policy do not recognise administrative boundaries. It's been a well-established feature of policy, particularly in housing, but more generally that one looks at the market area and it doesn't necessarily correlate with administrative boundaries. And we haven't seen any clear reason for the local authorities. Why won't you take a different approach in this case that said, we have presented the information, and if there is a point that local authorities want to make in the local impact report or otherwise taking on board that information, that impacts the local level, and obviously they can make those points and we can consider them, but we don't see any strong reason at this stage to depart from the approach that has been taken.

01:00:15:02 - 01:00:46:23

And thirdly, on the Community Fund, Mr. Bedford mentioned at the outset that he was wanting to make sure that this was relevant to planning, but then went on to deal with the question of the amount of the funding that was going to be secured on the community fund. I didn't, in the end, understand this to be some objection in principle to the use of a fund to deal with intangible and residual effects. This mechanism has been used in other and other cases. We don't see any reason why it shouldn't be adopted here.

01:00:46:25 - 01:01:26:20

And indeed, the principle of what we're doing carries forward a mechanism that's been agreed by the joint local authorities under the existing 106. In any event, as for the question of, um, the scale of the contribution and the the ratcheting up, um, again, this can obviously be the subject of further submissions when you see the 106 when it's submitted. But again, it's important to remember that the mechanism that we are proposing is based on what is an existing arrangement that's been agreed with the joint local authorities.

01:01:26:22 - 01:01:58:16

So the pitching of the calibration of the fees, certainly up to a particular level, um, has already been agreed. And what we're doing is actually proposing an increase as you, as you increase your, your passenger numbers. So it's important not to forget that the whole basis upon which you're operating is one that's already been agreed with the local authorities, but we can discuss the level of that funding in due course whenever we submit the draft. Um, 106 to you other points that were made by Mr..

01:01:58:19 - 01:02:40:09

Um Bedford, uh, on uh, timescales of any, uh, potential gap and so on, rather than deal with those, neither better picked up through discussions. Um, as far as points raised by. Cognitive concerns. I think, uh, was recognized there, possibly more related to, uh, noise more generally. But it's important to recognize that insofar as the Community Fund, um, is intended to bring forward an existing mechanism which allows for noise supplements to be fed into the community fund, we're bringing that forward as part of the proposal.

01:02:40:11 - 01:03:27:24

That is not the entirety of the noise mitigation that we're proposing, and it's important not to lose sight of that. Um, one has a noise envelope we will be discussing, um, uh, tomorrow, but the, the, the section 106 on the community fund, as far as noise is concerned, is only one part of a far wider approach to mitigation. Same point applies to the allegation that the money is minuscule. The Community Fund is intended to pick up on intangible and residual effects, and it's not intended to effectively amount to the applicant's entire proposal as to mitigation of the effects of this scheme on the wider community, there's a far broader range of mitigation that we will consider as we go through the examination, and we don't accept that the funding that you'll see in the one who's six, um, is minuscule.

01:03:28:12 - 01:03:59:22

Um, as for Mr. Chapman's points. I'm not sure if, uh, as a, as examining authority, you would find answers to these questions helpful, but insofar as Mr. Mania is able to pick them up, I'll ask them to deal with that, as there is a more specific point about the national economic assessment. As far as Ms..

Lockwood's points are concerned, I think they cover the same ground. She was talking about the use of fines and them coming into the community fund. Again, it's the same point.

01:03:59:24 - 01:04:35:18

These are part of wider, uh, mitigation relating to noise that we can cover as part of the noise session. Um, uh, later. And as far as the point about the benefit of the community fund being spread through different communities is concerned, the approach that we have been taking thus far is that the the Community Fund, split into the three areas with county council involvement is an appropriate mechanism because it's still allows for local democratic input in the decisions that are being made.

01:04:35:20 - 01:05:05:26

One always has to strike a balance when one is running a mechanism such as this between, um, a degree of structure and simplicity and the organisation on the one hand, and then something which becomes too complex to operate effectively at the other. At the moment, our approach has been to relate that to the three county council areas, and then the county councils are able to, uh, act as the appropriate mechanism to feed down the benefits to more local areas. But again, as Mr.

01:05:05:28 - 01:05:23:03

Bedford indicated, that's something that's going to be the subject of further discussion, and we can update the examining authority in due course on that. Um, as for other points that have been raised, I'll ask if, um, Mr. Jones has anything to add, and then we'll go down the we'll go down the rest of the table.

01:05:25:01 - 01:06:04:21

Occurring attorneys for the applicant. I mean, really, just to follow what Mr. Linus. Just described these specific data points are it's the first time we're hearing of them. But just to take the example of, uh, economic activity rates, which was the one that Mr. Bedford referred to, um, in many ways, the advantage of the blended approach to the baseline data that we've taken in the assessment, as I described earlier, is it actually within the appendices to the assessment? We do have visibility of what economic activity rate trends, both within the assessment areas have been and at an individual authority area have been, uh, since 2011 through to 2019.

01:06:04:23 - 01:06:47:12

So it would be incorrect to presume that the assessment hasn't had regard to the general direction of travel that was occurring within that particular metric as one example. Um, and conscious related to that, and probably possibly slightly straying into item five, um, around the broader points around housing and labor supply, of course, as we'll be able to describe when we get to that item. Um, this is it's relevant to think about the proportionality of this within the context of the overall scale of the labor force within the assessment areas, and indeed the surplus of labour supply based on planned housing growth and other factors which we can describe in more detail under item five.

01:06:47:24 - 01:07:06:05

Um, but I think what that tells us is that the the dial would have to turn incredibly far on economic activity or indeed inactivity in order to have any material effect on the conclusions that we've drawn in that respect, but perhaps reserve further comment on that as part of item five, because there's probably a broader point to make on that. Thank you.

01:07:11:07 - 01:07:19:00

I'm Scott Linus for the applicant. I'll just ask Mr. Maney if he wants to add anything on the national economic assessment point that was raised, Mr. Chapman.

01:07:20:15 - 01:08:05:11

Yes. Uh, Andy Meanie. I'm partner at Oxburgh. I've been working on the local and national economic impact reports. Um, Doctor Chapman asked about price bases for the local economic impact report and the National. So in the context of the local report, we were using the latest full year of price data, uh, which was 2022 at the time of the um, uh, application going in last year. Um, in the National Economic Impact report, we are trying to reflect the Department for Transport's transport appraisal guidance or tag, um, and that transport appraisal guidance uses a price base of 2010.

01:08:05:13 - 01:08:36:03

So in that case, we are constrained, if you like, by seeking to follow the guidance in using the price base that's recommended in that guidance, which is 2010. That would be the same if this was a road scheme or a or a high speed rail scheme. Um, they would all use that similar price base, because then that enables the Department for transport to compare across different types of schemes on the same price basis. So that's the reason for the difference between, uh, the two assessments.

01:08:37:20 - 01:09:10:18

Uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. There was one final point raised on consultation. Uh, as I've said, uh, the proposition at the moment is that the grant making panels will comprise representatives of the community foundations and the county councils. Their role will be to represent the voice of the local community as far as the wider consultation is concerned. Obviously, um, it's taken place as part of the PR and through this application. So the local community has the chance to respond to the mechanisms that we propose.

01:09:10:20 - 01:09:16:28

But I don't know if Masari has or Mr. Norwood has anything they want to add as far as consultation is concerned on the community fund.

01:09:18:00 - 01:09:50:12

And no, I think, um, Alison added for the applicant, I think Mr. Linus has, um, covered that and it is important that, um, it's recognised the, the quite extensive role that the community foundations play and the networks that they have, um, within communities. Um, but, uh, yeah, I think that that does cover that part. Um, if it's helpful, I will just pick up. I just wanted to, um, specific points, um, that were raised just because it might be helpful. Clarification. Uh, just in relation to, um, uh, Mrs.

01:09:50:14 - 01:10:38:22

Lockwood's point regarding the noise fines. So, as Mr. Linus has said, the noise um, fines will be included in the future um, fund. Um, but that is linked to our departure noise limits. Um, so there may have been just in terms of the way it was, um, described, it's not directly linked to the number of complaints that are received. It's actually through our departure noise limits. And that's, um, uh, monitored and reported. Uh, just in terms of another comment regarding the current constraints of the Gatwick Airport, um, Community Trust funding, um, that we will obviously be be addressing some of

those, um, constraints that we've had feedback on, um, which potentially relate to, um, some of the, you know, criteria and limitations ons.

01:10:39:06 - 01:11:22:04

Um, and then just on the final point around, um, local awareness, we do currently quite, um, extensively promote both the Gatwick um Foundation Fund and the Gatwick Airport Community Trust. Um, we've currently been running a campaign, both last year and this year to try and increase the level of, um, local media coverage, but also through our engagements with the local parishes. Um, but, um, I hear the feedback, um, today. And so we will make a point of ensuring that, uh, in future engagement with local communities is really, you know, raising the profile of the London Gatwick Community Fund in the future so that everybody is aware of the the benefits that can be gained from that and the application process.

01:11:26:09 - 01:11:58:13

Thank you. I'd now like to move on to agenda item number four, which is the proposed employment skills and business strategy. In summary, this strategy sets out how Gatwick Airport Limited intends to maximise economic benefits for communities and businesses generated by proposals to make best use of Gatwick existing runways and infrastructure, and the specific details of the strategy will be set out in an implementation plan. And this plan would be secured via a new section 106 agreement.

01:11:58:15 - 01:12:37:28

Turning to the applicant, and I think it's fair to say that the majority of local authorities commented on the proposed strategy in their relevant representations. And as a summary, and this is just my summary, it is very high level overview. It was evident that many local authorities felt that the current strategy appears to be based on what could be done or achieved, rather than what will be done. I think this was stated because they felt that the strategy isn't supported by clear costings or resourcing considerations, and as such, the local authorities felt that this lessened the confidence that the proposed outputs would be actually achievable.

01:12:38:18 - 01:12:58:06

And I did read a number of times that, as such, they felt that there was no certainty that any economic benefits would be delivered locally. And whilst I appreciate you will no doubt respond to this in your deadline one submissions, I would like you to provide a response to these concerns today, please.

01:12:59:16 - 01:13:06:07

Scotland's for the applicant. Thank you ma'am. I'll ask Mr. Hunter sitting next to me to pick up this point, please. Thank you.

01:13:06:12 - 01:13:08:13

Um, Andy Hunt for the applicant.

01:13:08:22 - 01:13:17:02

Um, I think things have moved on probably quite considerably since the application and, uh, since the relevant reps were submitted. Um.

01:13:19:07 - 01:13:54:10



I think the, the nature of the PSBs, we're intending that it runs for nine years after the commencement of dual runway operations. So it's covering a very long period of time. So by necessity, it's a strategic document that needs to set out an overall framework for a series of kind of themed activities. Um, and as we said, um, for the detail being the, the implementation plans, which themselves are capable of being updated and they will be supported by delivery plans. So we've got an ability to, um, set out a sort of intermediate level to be agreed with partners.

01:13:54:16 - 01:14:28:02

Um, how we do that? Um, I suppose the other point to say, in response to some of the things that, um, of the bid and relevant reps, we haven't identified any adverse impacts that we are mitigating. This is about enhancing benefits and focusing them locally, in particular in the areas and communities that are affected. And that's obviously in line with kind of precedent on major cos um, we've as I say, we've continued to work with the local authorities. Um, we've shared, uh, a draft structure of what the implementation plans would look like.

01:14:28:12 - 01:15:09:05

Um, we had a topic working group meeting on this before Christmas. We've had feedback from four of the authorities. Um, and we've shared a draft of the section 106, um, setting out how those activities will be secured, secured and funded. Um, and the implementation plan will set out five key things. So firstly, what will be delivered, who the partners and stakeholders that Gail will work with and how the governance monitoring and reporting arrangements a resourcing strategy. So how that SPS funding will be applied for each of the implementation across the period that the implementation plan covers and then milestones, uh, targets, outcomes and projected impact.

01:15:09:07 - 01:15:42:28

So effectively there'll be a sort of business plan for the spending of the money, which will be secured by, um, the, uh, the section 106. Um, I think the authorities now have more of an understanding of, uh, how the detail will be filled in. There is more work to do. Um, and we intend working with the local authorities to do that. Um, and it's through that process of drafting that first implementation plan that will collectively agree what the priorities are, um, and how the funding can be targeted.

01:15:43:10 - 01:16:20:24

Um, we're anticipating that the section 106 will, um, require Gail to prepare the implementation plan. Um, and for that to be approved by a steering group made up of the local authorities, Gatwick and other partners. So through that mechanism, there is an approval mechanism, um, by which the money and the spending can be agreed and the reporting and any amendments, uh, can take place over time. Um, again, it's it's similar to the approach taken on other very big long term discos, um, where there's a kind of high level strategy document and then documents that are capable of being updated, controlled by obligations.

01:16:22:16 - 01:16:31:25

Thank you. You mentioned that you've been doing quite a lot of work on the implementation plan. Is it possible to submit a draft version of that into the examination?

01:16:33:09 - 01:16:54:11

Andy Hunt, the applicant, and it's one of the requests from the authorities that we actually appended it to the section 106. So we're discussing that with them. I think we probably need to progress it a little bit more with them to to flesh that out. I see absolutely no reason why we wouldn't submit it to you once, uh, it's been progressed a little bit further so that you can have a clearer idea of what it is that we're proposing.

01:16:54:24 - 01:16:57:22

You have any idea which deadline that would be?

01:17:01:17 - 01:17:02:10

Yeah, I.

01:17:04:05 - 01:17:14:27

But deadline three. I think we'd like to discuss it further with the local authorities and reach a position where the structure is is kind of agreed. Um, and we've only had the initial feedback on on the 106 in the last.

01:17:15:00 - 01:17:23:09

No, I'm obviously not holding you to a deadline. It's just useful for us to understand when the documents will be available to us.

01:17:24:09 - 01:17:33:08

Now Scotland for the applicant? Yes. I think if we aim for deadline three, ma'am, that might give us opportunity to progress discussions.

01:17:33:10 - 01:17:41:06

Yeah, that that's acceptable. If it's not going to be deadline three rather than just not submitting it can you let us know please.

01:17:41:15 - 01:17:44:14

Scotland. Yes, ma'am. We'll keep the the updated.

01:17:44:20 - 01:18:16:06

Thank you. Um, that was helpful. Um, noting your comments made last week regarding legal agreements, I think it was issue specific hearing too. Is there any reason why this strategy. And associated documents couldn't be secured as a requirement. And as I'm sure you aware, there are several major CEOs which do have. This as a requirement. The reason I understand you said it's enhancement.

01:18:17:08 - 01:18:34:10

In the strategy that I've read there is reference to mitigation. So. I think perhaps that needs to be. Look, SAS, but my question still stands. Is it possible to be a requirement and if not, why?

01:18:35:01 - 01:19:13:11

It's got minus for the applicant. I think from recollection last week, two reasons that are often given for dealing with matters through an obligation rather than requirements is that if there's a financial

contribution involved or there are detailed mechanism which are better set out in the fuller text of, um, of an obligation, that's that's the rationale for the implementation plan being dealt with through the 106. Um, at the moment, um, we don't understand there to be any disagreement on that with the, uh, with the local authorities.

01:19:13:23 - 01:19:35:26

Uh, and indeed, as I said, this brings forward a matter that's been dealt with through obligations previously. So at the moment, uh, our intention is to deal with it through, um, through 106 for the reasons that were essentially given last week, uh, money and the detailed arrangements being better reflected. And, and in the terms of the 106 rather than the, purely the requirement.

01:19:36:26 - 01:19:48:21

Thank you. Is it possible to split the two? Could you have a requirement that deals with the non-monetary aspects and the monetary aspects sitting in a section 1 or 6.

01:19:51:05 - 01:20:10:18

The reason. You know, the reason for my question is I am keen. Should, um, this DCO be made, that any benefit to local communities is secured? Because, again, the question that I keep asking is what if there is a delay? To section 106.

01:20:12:06 - 01:20:52:16

Of Scotland for the applicant. I think I'd have to strike a note of caution in terms of sort of splitting mechanisms like that between money and arrangements, between requirements and a 106. As a matter of practicality, it's often best to have it dealt with in the same in the same document. Um, largely for reasons that were given last week, as I've, uh, as I've mentioned, um, we don't see, uh, that the section 106, uh, controls, um, should be treated differently as far as the quality of potential enforcement action is concerned.

01:20:53:02 - 01:21:25:06

Um, given the arrangements that we are proposing, um, as I've said, the local authorities have, uh, treated the existing 106 obligations as an appropriate method for securing these measures. And we don't see any reason why, in principle, that shouldn't continue. Um, I recall from the Irish two hearing last week that we were going to, um, uh, explain why matters were dealt with in obligations rather than requirements, and we can pick that up and provide further detail on this.

01:21:25:18 - 01:21:26:13

Uh, ma'am. Thank you.

01:21:27:15 - 01:21:35:02

Thank you. That's useful. Um, those are the questions I have for the applicant. Turning to Mr. Bedford, is there anything you'd like to comment on?

01:21:37:08 - 01:21:58:23

Huh? Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. I think there are two broad, uh, matters that we would want to raise at this stage. Uh, the first, uh, is, uh, the scope of the, um.

01:22:00:20 - 01:22:41:18

Strategy strategy, and we don't consider that the current iteration gives adequate information on the baseline makeup of the area, uh, in order to inform the strategy. But partly that's linked back to what we were talking about under agenda item three. But more particularly, we think that there is not an adequate review of the, um, current arrangements for skills and training, uh, within the area.

01:22:41:22 - 01:23:16:22

And so if you're not identifying adequately what you've currently got, you can't pick up so easily on what gaps in provision there may be. So that's an issue in terms of the scope and content of the strategy, which we think needs further work. And then the second issue which has already been highlighted is the importance. Of having a cohort implementation plan that can be considered at this stage.

01:23:17:03 - 01:24:01:03

During the course of the examination, so that the final version is something that is capable of being implemented. At an early stage in line with the delivery of the project, were it to be consented, because it will be important to ensure that insofar as, for example, ones dealing with supply chains once dealing with skills bases, that if there are benefits to be secured to the local labour force and to local businesses that they are secured from the outset of the construction period not passed through.

01:24:01:05 - 01:24:11:00

And consequently, it's important, therefore, to have the implementation strategy up and running at a very early stage. So that's our other area of concern.

01:24:11:18 - 01:24:24:10

Thank you. Thank you. Is there anybody else in the room or virtually who'd like to speak on these matters? Um, Miss Christie, do you want to come to the table? Then I'll take the other two people in turn.

01:24:33:05 - 01:25:08:19

Thank you, Anna Christie, Sussex chamber. Um, regarding the, um, the comments that have been made in terms of the applicant liaising with the local authorities in relation to the proposed employment, skills and business strategy. Just, um, I would like to also comment that the local skills improvement plan, which follows the skills for jobs white paper set out by government, um, to reshape the education system and better meet the needs of employers, should also collaborate with us as part of our skills group.

01:25:08:21 - 01:25:32:11

We have the three local authorities in Sussex on that skills board. And um, we do liaise with the local authorities as well. Um, in terms of their employment, skills and business strategy. So I would like to request that the applicant also liaises with us at Sussex Chamber and the local authorities. So we ensure that it is a unified plan throughout the whole of the county. Thank you.

01:25:33:10 - 01:25:37:09

Thank you very much. Miss Scott, would you like to come to the table?

01:25:40:13 - 01:26:14:15

Thank you, Lisa Scott Parish Council. I've got a couple of points. Um, one is an influx of workers for the construction would be a drain on the availability of, um, workers and able to perform the retrofit and decarbonization required for the country to keep us in line with the government's legally binding, um, carbon reduction targets. The second point is, I would presume the majority of construction workers are likely to be male.

01:26:14:20 - 01:26:44:04

And how would the local residents be protected from an increase in the, uh, or a change in the demographics of the area? And how will we protect be protected from the drawing in of other industries, such as the sex worker industry, which are, um, seem to be following large construction and development, um, projects? And this is a global recognized process. Thank you.

01:26:45:21 - 01:26:46:28

Thank you, Mr. North.

01:26:54:09 - 01:27:33:21

Thank you. Brett. Gabby diamond initiative. Uh, sensing business groups. Um, particularly on the skills and training part of the, uh, work that we've seen and reviewed. Or is it a question from not just around some of the other work that we've seen going on, but also around about the fact that there seems to be not a focus currently on reskilling? We know that in this life of this project, as it moves on, it's not just an immediate issue, but we'd like to see some work about how are we going to take certainly the over 55 and others as we're seeing work life time expand, because we know that currently up to about 14%, 15% of workers in the next 10 to 15 years will end up doing roles that either don't exist, or they will be changing significantly as technology drives.

01:27:33:23 - 01:27:46:06

And we'd like to see that reflected not just in the applicant, but also across local authorities, because it's taking time for education and skills groups to be able to meet the demand that we're seeing. And that's a major concern of lots of business groups currently.

01:27:47:21 - 01:27:50:17

Thank you, Mr. North. I turn to the applicant.

01:27:53:13 - 01:27:57:00

Sorry. It's very dark. I didn't see you.

01:28:00:06 - 01:28:38:07

Uh, Malcolm Fillmore Parish Council, I'd like to just address the issues of section 106. Um, my understanding is this is an agreement entered into between Gatwick Airport and Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council. Um, there was a reference to a steering group to discuss it, but, uh, to what extent are the community in general, uh, involved in that steering groups so that it can be more, uh, a wide ranging type of, uh, uh, commitment on behalf of Gatwick to the local communities.

01:28:40:16 - 01:28:42:14

Thank you. Is there anybody else?

01:28:44:09 - 01:28:47:19

Don't. And over to the applicant for response please.

01:28:48:16 - 01:28:52:14

Scotland. After the applicant allows Mr. Hunt to pick up on any points he wishes to please.

01:28:54:01 - 01:29:28:13

All right. Thank you. Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, in terms of the scope of the ASB's, uh, and the need to, you know, set out what's, uh, currently being provided in terms of skills and training. We think that's a matter for the implementation plan that the SBS is meant to be. Long term, the providers of skills and training will change over that period of time. We've seen that already. You know, within the lifetime of this government, they introduced local economic partnerships. They've abolished local economic partnerships. Um, so the kind of the strategy needs to be capable of kind of lasting over that longer period.

01:29:28:22 - 01:30:04:28

Um, so to Mr. Bedford's point, we're engaging with a range of partners. We want to engage in more detail with the local authorities and understanding what the provision is. We know Crawley Borough Council have raised the issue about working with employee Crawley. We want to have those sorts of conversations so that the implementation can implementation plan, can set out who will do what. So I think more broadly, this isn't, uh, a Gatwick specific strategy. And to pick up the point, um, that um, uh, others have made the chamber and um, so it's, it's going to be a collective endeavor, um, to get the best benefits out of this.

01:30:05:00 - 01:30:37:23

We don't want to start new things up. We want to be funding existing organisations. We want to work with partners to ensure that we're enhancing what already exists. And it's through that implementation plan development process, uh, that we will do that. Um, in terms of the point around timing, um, you know, we agree we, we want to kind of make progress on the implementation plan. Um, Gatwick has already employed two project officers to start to develop the detailed work, in particular around construction and around the supply chain.

01:30:37:25 - 01:31:10:02

So that work is ongoing now, effectively piloting what will be rolled out more fully should this, um, receive consent. So we understand the point about timing and the need to be getting on with it. And, um, Gatwick is uh, is backing that with, uh, with its money now. Um. Uh, to the point about reskilling. Um, I think that is within the, um, the proposed themes of the PSBs. Um, that is an area that, uh, can and will need to be addressed.

01:31:10:20 - 01:31:42:03

Um, as I say, I think, you know, we want the implementation plan to be the agreed priorities of, uh, local authorities, uh, and ourselves. It's not simply what we need. It's about how this lands locally and making sure that we, um, uh, maximise the funding that we, uh, bring to the table and in particular, the job opportunities. The really big win here is that we have a lot of jobs that are going to become

available, and we will also make available new vacancies that arise of churn within the existing, uh, activities on the airport.

01:31:42:28 - 01:32:02:20

Um, in terms of the the steering group and community representation, we're anticipating that will be through the local authorities as the, uh, elected representatives. And given the scale that we're talking about and the very large, uh, labor market. Um, so we intend doing it that way. Um.

01:32:04:15 - 01:32:37:07

The point about construction workers. It doesn't really sit under the, uh, the BBS. Um. We'll return to this, uh, this afternoon. But the assessment we've made there in terms of the number of non home based construction workers is extremely conservative. Um, the averages for the proportion of workers who are non home based in the construction industry is 5% regionally, 7% nationally. We've done an assessment on the basis of 20% through caution to understand what the housing market impacts would be in a very kind of worst case scenario.

01:32:37:09 - 01:32:49:24

And the will of course, because of conduct to, um, manage worker behavior, um, and a range of other measures to ensure that the impacts of the construction phase on, on local communities are limited. But as I was slightly off today's agenda.

01:32:50:04 - 01:32:55:21

Could you remind me how the code of conduct for construction workers would be secured?

01:33:02:04 - 01:33:06:02

Andy Hunt for the applicant. Can we come back to you on that? I think it's through the code of construction practice.

01:33:06:04 - 01:33:07:09

Thank you. That's fine.

01:33:10:09 - 01:33:27:19

Thank you. That was very useful. And it's now 1130. So before we move on to agenda item number five, we adjourn for, uh, 20 minutes. So we come back at 1155. Now adjourned.